

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,530	07/06/2001	Toshiya Kojima	Q64665	3383
7:	590 07/29/2003			
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW			EXAMINER	
	C 20037-3213 LIANG,		Q64665 3383 EXAMINER LIANG, LEONARD S	EONARD S
	·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2853	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	09/899,530	KOJIMA ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Leonard S Liang	2853				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe						
THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION Is abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	ON FOR ALLOWANCE. cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application i	in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date o b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in that an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of that statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension for the final Office action; or (2) as se	ee under et forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplify	ying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	I be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed amer	ndment			
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		sidered but does NOT plac	ce the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	Y to issues which were new	vly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			n			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>3,6,10 and 13</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 11-12.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. ☐ Other:						
	-	Stanban D. Malaria				
		Stephen D. Meier Primary Examiner				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive, especially in view of the applicant's narrow interpretation of the claims..